UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/663,688	09/17/2003	09/17/2003 Koichi Nagoshi		3984
	7590 07/31/200 & BERNSTEIN, P.L.		EXAMINER	
1950 ROLAND	CLARKE PLACE		MUHEBBULLAH, SAJEDA	
RESTON, VA 20191			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2174	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			07/31/2008	ELECTRONIC

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

gbpatent@gbpatent.com pto@gbpatent.com

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/663,688	NAGOSHI ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Examinor	Airoille	

	SAJEDA MUHEBBULLAH	2174	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>08 July 2008</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPL	ICATION IN CONDITION FOR AL	LOWANCE.	
1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following rapplication in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit al (with appeal fee) in compliance v	, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adno event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (I MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth i tter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	date of the final rejection	n.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extremely an extra transfer of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply origin	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compl filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi AMENDMENTS	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be  (a) They raise new issues that would require further core  (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below  (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or  (d) They present additional claims without canceling a content of the second c	nsideration and/or search (see NOT w); er form for appeal by materially red	E below); lucing or simplifying th	
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).  4.  The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12  5.  Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):  6.  Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowed the solicity (s):			
non-allowable claim(s).  7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [ how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:  AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE		be entered and an ex	xplanation of
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary  10. The affidavit are alternative and the approximate the sufficient reasons.	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea and was not earlier presented. Se	l and/or appellant fails e 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1)	s to provide a ).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER		•	
<ul> <li>11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet.</li> <li>12. Note the extraphed Information Displaceurs Statement(s).</li> </ul>		condition for allowand	de pecause:
<ul><li>12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (</li><li>13. ☐ Other:</li></ul>	r i 0/56/06) Paper No(s)		
/Stephen S. Hong/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2178			

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's arguments filed 07/08/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

## Applicant argued the following:

- a) Since the multifunction device of KITADA et al., has a facsimile transmission capability, these additional recited features of the present invention are not necessary and are not disclosed therein.
  - b) Routing of a scanned document is not "based on the information regarding the menu".
- c) Kitada does not disclose sending scanned image data together with "predetermined information indicating another multifunction apparatus".
- d) Tanimoto does not disclose another multifunction apparatus capable of transmitting the image data to a receiving apparatus by facsimile transmission.

## The Examiner disagrees for the following reasons:

- Per a), As noted by the Applicant Kitada may or may not have a facsimile transmission capability. Therefore the multifunction device of Kitada may be a device without the fax ability.
- Per b), Kitada teaches the parameters used to route a scanned document are based on the displayed menu (Kitada, para.0039, lines 5-16).
- Per c), Kitada does teach the sending of the image data with predetermined information indicating another multifunction apparatus (Kitada, para.0026, para.0033, a user's profile indicates the fax server the fax documents are to be sent to along with the fax number of the recipient fax device the document is to be eventually sent to).
- Per d), In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). Kitada teaches the another multifunction device to be a fax server however does not explicitly teach this fax server to fax the information to a recipient fax device. Tanimoto teaches a facsimiler server which is capable of multiple functions which includes faxing information received at the fax server to recipient fax machines (col.5, lines 57-60).